



Sugar City

Steven Adams, Mayor
Quinton Owens, Building Inspector
Wendy McLaughlin, Clerk-Treasurer
Shelley Jones, Deputy Clerk-Treasurer
Arlynn Jacobson, Public Works Director

March 16, 2023

Senate State Affairs Committee Members:

The work done by the Citizens for Decency and Senator Cook is to be applauded. Simple steps like this can make a big difference in the future of our youth and society.

I strongly support Senate Bill 1163.

Kind Regards,

Steve Adams, Ph.D.
Mayor, City of Sugar City

Ph: 208-356-7561
Fax: 208-359-2654

Office Hours: 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

P.O. Box 56 - 10 E. Center
Sugar City, ID 83448

Attachment 2

Joyce Brewer

From: Khara Boender <kboender@ccianet.quorumoutbox.com>
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2023 2:53 PM
To: Joyce Brewer
Subject: CCIA Comments in Advance of 3/20 Senate Committee on State Affairs Hearing (SB 1163)
Attachments: 2023-3-20_CCIA Written Comments_ID-SB-1163.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

Good afternoon,

I am State Policy Director at the Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA). In advance of Monday's Senate Committee on State Affairs hearing, I respectfully submit the attached comments in opposition to SB 1163.

CCIA is an international, not-for-profit membership organization representing a broad cross section of communications and technology firms. For more than 50 years, CCIA has promoted open markets, open systems, open networks, and full, fair, and open competition.

We appreciate the Committee's consideration of these comments and stand ready to provide additional information as the legislature considers proposals related to technology policy.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to reach out to me at kboender@ccianet.org.

Regards,

Khara

March 20, 2023

Senate Committee on State Affairs
Attn: Joyce Brewer, Secretary
State Capitol Building
700 West Jefferson Street, Room WW55
Boise, ID 83720-0081

Re: SB 1163 - "PROTECTION OF MINORS" (Oppose)

Dear Chair Guthrie and Members of the Senate Committee on State Affairs:

On behalf of the Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA), I write to respectfully oppose SB 1163.

CCIA is an international, not-for-profit trade association representing a broad cross-section of communications and technology firms.¹ Proposed regulations on the interstate provision of digital services therefore can have a significant impact on CCIA members. Recent sessions have seen an increasing volume of state legislation related to the regulation of what digital services host and how they host it. While recognizing that policymakers are appropriately interested in the digital services that make a growing contribution to the U.S. economy, these bills require study, as they may raise constitutional concerns,² conflict with federal law, and risk impeding digital services in their efforts to appropriately manage content.

CCIA strongly believes children deserve an enhanced level of security and privacy online. Currently, there are a number of efforts among our members to incorporate protective design features into their websites and platforms.³ CCIA's members have been leading the effort in raising the standard for children's safety and privacy across our industry by creating new features, settings, parental tools, and protections that are age-appropriate and tailored to the differing developmental needs of young people.

However, requiring a state-specific default filter would present significant technical difficulties for businesses. Typically, internet service providers (ISPs) govern which websites users can access. For example, known pirating sites are blocked by ISPs, not the manufacturer who produces the devices. It is also important to consider how the bill's provisions would apply to devices that do not have precise location-tracking technology or only connect via WiFi. Similarly, the bill raises questions surrounding how to account for devices purchased online from an out-of-state location, or for devices purchased on the secondary market. While it is easier to determine whether a device is activated in the state based on point of sale, the myriad options available to consumers to purchase devices from outside of Idaho raises significant questions about how the bill's provisions would apply.

We appreciate the opportunity to further expand on our concerns with the proposed legislation.

¹ For 50 years, CCIA has promoted open markets, open systems, and open networks. CCIA members employ more than 1.6 million workers, invest more than \$100 billion in research and development, and contribute trillions of dollars in productivity to the global economy. A list of CCIA members is available at <https://www.ccianet.org/members>.

² Eric Goldman, The Constitutionality of Mandating Editorial Transparency, 73 Hastings L. J. 1203 (2022), https://repository.uchastings.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3985&context=hastings_law_journal

³ Jordan Rodell, *Why Implementing Education is a Logical Starting Point for Children's Safety Online*, Disruptive Competition Project (Feb. 7, 2023), <https://www.project-disco.org/privacy/020723-why-implementing-education-is-a-logical-starting-point-for-childrens-safety-online/>.



1. A mandatory device filter would remove a user's individual ability to tailor preferences regarding content and services.

Mandating that a device activate a filter intended to prevent younger users from accessing certain content ignores the fact that adults, by and large, are the primary users of the cellular phone and tablet devices that the bill explicitly seeks to regulate. In the global economy, there are many products and services that we use that are not, by default, designed for younger users. For example, automobiles are designed with seats and seatbelts for adult consumers. However, car seats designed specifically for children's safety are available and recommended for use to ensure that children are as safe as possible when riding in an automobile. In a similar vein, many devices and services have content filtering technologies that allow parents to individually tailor settings and preferences to enable both adults and children to make appropriate choices about the type of content and services they are able to see and use. These types of filters and settings, however, are not activated by default. SB 1163 could invite significant consumer confusion for adults who are not aware such filters aimed for children are set by default. CCIA would recommend that the use of such filters continue to be voluntary and an opt-in feature for the specific consumers who wish to utilize them.

2. Businesses operating online depend on clear regulatory certainty across jurisdictions nationwide.

Ambiguous and inconsistent regulation at the state or local levels would undermine business certainty, creating significant confusion surrounding compliance. This type of regulatory patchwork may deter new entrants, harming competition, innovation, and consumers. Devices sold into a national market are not and cannot be designed for functionality to trigger by the mere fact that they have moved within a state's borders.

3. Providing a cure period would be beneficial to consumers and businesses alike.

CCIA recommends that the legislation include a cure period of at least 30 days. This would allow for actors operating in good faith to correct an unknowing or technical violation, reserving formal lawsuits and violation penalties for the bad actors that the bill intends to address. This would also focus the government's limited resources on enforcing the law's provisions for those that persist in violations despite being made aware of such alleged violations. Such notice allows consumers to receive injunctive relief, but without the time and expense of bringing a formal suit.

*

*

*

*

We appreciate your consideration of these comments and stand ready to provide additional information as the legislature considers proposals related to technology policy.

Sincerely,

Khara Boender
State Policy Director
Computer & Communications Industry Association

I support the idea of having a default filter on smartphones that assists parents in encouraging healthy, safe adolescent internet consumption, whether at home or elsewhere. In essence, the filter is designed to filter out material that is harmful to minors. It ultimately places the decision in the parents' hands, as they will have the ability to disengage the filter if they choose.

Why the emphasis on this bill? Early exposure to pornography appears to derail healthy sexual development, increase risk of risky sexual behavior in adolescents, and has the potential to increase aggressive and law-breaking behaviors in adolescents.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9309635/>. Also, first time exposure often is in the home (intentionally or by accident) where access to digital devices is the norm. Thus, it would seem to me common sensical to assist parents in helping their children learn to navigate the internet safely, without the fear or concern of "happening" upon a pornographic site. Or if they choose to seek out that material, it may block their access and, hopefully, increase parent-child conversations about the nature of pornographic material. Furthermore, children's brains are still in the development stages for most of their adolescence and into young adulthood. Their brain neural pathways are constantly being built and nurtured / myelinated based on what they are exposed to. Thus, it would make sense that exposure to pornographic material at this age may begin the development of neural pathways that will only thrive if nurtured with pornography. This potentially could wreak havoc on healthy sexual development and healthy relationships.

A few more resources to consider:

Family Research Council: <https://downloads.frc.org/EF/EF12D43.pdf>

https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/nyar_savannah/2020/2020/23/; this has a PPTX download which is the presentation referenced in the overview at this link.

MEMORANDUM

TO: JOYCE BREWER, SECRETARY
STATE SENATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
SSTAF@SENATE.IDAHO.GOV

FROM: ROBERT E. CHAMBERS, RESIDENT
CITY OF REXBURG, IDAHO

SUBJECT: SENATE BILL NO. 1163
“PARENTAL RIGHTS PROTECTION OF MINOR ACT”

DATE: MARCH 16, 2023

To the honorable chair and State Senate Affairs committee members.

I offer my support to Senate Bill 1163, the “Parental Rights Protection of Minor Act.”

The proposed legislation seeks to protect children from exposure to harmful material online while not overburdening Free Speech.

More and more of our youth carry handheld devices which makes them an easy target for purveyors of pornography. Because pornography affects the mental and physical well-being of our children and adults and has been proven to be a doorway to greater crimes against children and women, I support efforts to protect our youth from this ever-growing industry.

Handheld devices already have parental controls on them that allow parents to filter out material that is harmful to minors. The software is already there, but due to the difficulty of setting it up, most parents fail to turn it on. This bill simply states that the filter must be turned on by default if the device is activated within the state of Idaho and a pass code given to the adult to turn off the filter if the adult so chooses.

This bill does not affect the retailer, or the provider. It only affects the manufacturer. This bill also has no budgetary impact.

I encourage this committee to give this bill a “do pass” recommendation. Thank you.

Joyce Brewer

From: Sydney Dancliff <sydney.dancliff42@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2023 1:40 AM
To: Joyce Brewer
Subject: Minor Smartphone Filter Bill S1163

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

I am Sydney Dancliff, and I am testifying in support of Senate Bill 1163. I am a current students studying the family and marriage. I also work two jobs where I am surrounded by children and parents. I work hard to learn and grow in my academics so that someday I can help broken family systems.

Having studied the family and the development of relationships over the past year and a half I have learned much of the effects of several addictions. Pornography being one of these heavy addictions. I have worked along side people in addiction recovery programs and have seen how distorted the mind and being can become due to addictions. I have personally seen how pornography can affect the family, as I have seen it affect a close family members life.

The youth in todays world are already faced with so many pressures and challenges. Let us help them! Encourage our youth and provide them with tools that can help them continue to grow. Putting filters on youths phones to block pornography could be the first step to creating and cultivating a whole new society that could change the world, for good.

My greatest sincerity,

- Sydney Dancliff

Joyce Brewer

From: Michael Downs <michaeljdowns99@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 19, 2023 8:54 AM
To: Joyce Brewer
Cc: craigrcobia@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on Bill S1163

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

To whomever it may concern,

My name is Mike Downs. I am currently a student attending Brigham Young University-Idaho and I am majoring in Software Engineering. A dear friend of mine brought to my attention bill S1163 which is being discussed today concerning the protection of minors from pornographic materials with technology. Though I could not testify in person or over video call due to my work schedule, I would like to share at least a few thoughts concerning the bill that is being discussed today.

When I first read that manufacturers would be required to have some sort of filtering system on certain materials, I agreed with the idea. I think it is a very good thing that should be strongly considered and implemented. The reason why I say this is because I have personally experienced such a thing growing up. When I was 13 years old, my first device was an Apple iPod Touch. I worked hard to earn the money to buy the device and was thrilled when I was able to finally purchase it. Even though I was so occupied by what I could do with my new device (like playing games, listening to music, etc.), I am grateful for the wisdom of my parents to establish some protections on the device. In my opinion, they foresaw the dangers that could come from such a useful tool, if left unchecked.

Now Apple at the time did not have many protections, at least concerning specific filters like the idea being discussed. However, Apple did still provide my parents with the ability to disable some apps and allowed them to enable a passcode to prevent these disabled apps from being reenabled without permission. This feature on the device was nice because it forced me and my siblings to take our devices to our parents and explain to them why we needed the internet app unlocked or why we wanted to download any apps we wanted.

Growing up this way was honestly really good for me and my siblings. It allowed my parents to know what we were possibly doing. Though this was not bad, the internet started becoming more and more involved in everyone's daily life. As time went on, some third-party companies allowed the possibility for you to download their apps and automatically provide filters to images and videos by blocking almost all of them. Some of these apps even sent reports to their parent's devices to show any potential warnings that their child may be viewing something inappropriate. These apps though were not necessarily always reliable and sometimes contained a lot of software bugs.

Since that time, these third-party apps have gotten a lot better, but are not perfect and still struggle. I feel that phones or other electronic devices can implement filters to block out pornographic material. Past

programs have already done similar things and can be implemented. Now even the best filters cannot catch everything. Our world is filled with pornographic materials. From television shows to websites to video games, some sort of pornography will get through. Also, even with the best filters offered, it is still up to parents in the home to implement and use these filters to protect their children.

With all that being said, if the way and the means are provided to help protect children, and possibly even some adults, from the terrible effects of pornography, I believe we can improve and maintain the quality of people in our society. If anything, we can show our children that we care for them and have respect for the human body. This bill should be strongly considered so we can protect current and future children.

Thank you for letting me share my thoughts,

Mike Downs

From: Marc Fannesbeck

90 N 4200 E

Rigby, Idaho 83442

208-521-8579

marcfannesbeck@gmail.com

To: Idaho State Senate

Subject: Support of Parental Rights Protection of Minors Act (Minor Smartphone Filter Bill) **SB 1163**

I am Marc Fannesbeck from Rigby, Idaho. As a resident of Rigby for nearly 30 years I have had the opportunity to raise 4 children and volunteer in the community in various ways alongside Idaho's youth. As I have interacted with the youth I have watched the devastating effects that pornography and other destructive content found on handheld and other devices has impacted some of the youth and their families. The impact has been very severe in some cases damaging them socially and causing them to have mental health concerns. As I have had the opportunity to interact with individuals that have had difficult life experiences at an early age their path to these difficulties began with exposure to material to pornographic content on the electronic devices they had access to. I have watched individuals with many resources to be successful find themselves weighed down by addiction to sexual materials that also lead them to other destructive behavior. Many of those that became addicted to pornographic images at a young age found themselves also struggling with extremely insecure thoughts, their educational pursuits and building constructive relationships.

As a grandfather of youth that will soon have full access to a handheld device and associate with friends that will be sharing the content of what they can access I ask that Bill 1057 be passed to protect my grandchildren, their friends, our families and the environment that they will develop life skills in. I believe there are many ways to strengthen the society that we live in and have a conviction that this one way of many to protect our youth from the damaging effects of pornographic content that can have a damning effect as the grow into adults and their contribution to our society. Again, I ask the Idaho State Senate to pass Bill 1057.

Thank You for your time!

Sincerely,

Marc Fannesbeck

Joyce Brewer

From: Julie Gneiting <juliegneiting@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 10:14 PM
To: Joyce Brewer
Cc: Craig Cobia
Subject: Bill S1163

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

To the honorable chair and State Senate Affairs committee members.

I offer my support to the Senate Bill S1163, the "Parental Rights Protection of Minor Act."

The proposed legislation seeks to protect children from exposure to harmful material online while not overburdening Free Speech. More and more of our youth carry handheld devices which makes them an easy target for sponsors of pornography. Exposure to porn at an early age can lead to poor mental health, sexism and objectification, sexual violence, and other negative consequences. Some of the direct effects from pornography are:

- Pornography harms a child's precious brain.
- Pornography harms a child's view of sex.
- Pornography harms a child's view of people.
- Pornography causes children to harm other children.

One of the most alarming results is that children tend to believe that such pornographic content is normal and can be consumed. They lack the full capacity to deal mentally, emotionally, and physically with sexual issues and portrayals, making it difficult for them to discern what is and is not acceptable in society according to social norms.

Before the use of the internet on devices was so readily available to children, pornography was easier to control and protect children from. Now, the very devices that we want them to become proficient at using are also direct pathways to harmful information.

Statistics like these are very eye opening and concerning:

- 40% of boys in grades four through 11 have admitted to searching for porn. Most of them do so often.
- The average age for a child to view porn is 11 years old.
- 93% of boys and 63% of girls have seen explicit content before turning 18.
- 70% of boys have spent more than 30 minutes searching for porn online.
- 35% of boys have searched for porn more than 10 times overall.
- Only 3% of boys and 17% of girls have not been exposed to adult content.

As a parent, I would appreciate knowing that a device I let my children use, was automatically protected from material that would have a very harmful effect of them.

While it is true that handheld devices already have parental controls on them that allow parents to filter out material harmful to minors, I am afraid my limited technical knowledge would not be enough to take care of the issue.

This bill simply states that the filter must be turned on by default if the device is activated within the state of Idaho and a pass code given to the adult to turn off the filter if the adult so chooses.

This bill does not affect the retailer, or the provider. It only affects the manufacturer. This bill also has no budgetary impact.

I support efforts, like this one, to protect our youth from this ever-growing industry and encourage this committee to give this bill a "do pass" recommendation. Thank you.

Julie Gneiting
566 N 3400 E
Lewisville, Idaho 83431
juliegneiting@gmail.com
208-390-1888

Joyce Brewer

From: Mike Guymon <guymonm@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2023 8:39 AM
To: Joyce Brewer
Cc: Craig Cobia
Subject: SB 1163
Attachments: Smarthphone filter bill.docx

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

Name: Mike Guymon
Address: 544 W 1st S Sugar City, ID 84448
Ph Number: 208 403-1704
Email address: guymonm@gmail.com

Re: SB 1163

I am a Licensed Clinical Social Worker in Idaho. I have lots of subjective experience through my practice in working with youth and adults who struggled with pornography exposure in their youth and the related concerns of that exposure, such as its effect on various forms of relationships in their lives. Please see the attachment for my comments.

Thank you

Mike

Joyce Brewer

From: David Horowitz <horowitz@mediacoalition.org>
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2023 5:22 PM
To: Joyce Brewer
Subject: S.B 1163

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

I received a notice that S.B. 1163 is up for a hearing on Monday in the Senate State Affairs committee.

What is the best way to submit written testimony in opposition to the bill? Is it best to send it to the committee for distribution or should I send the testimony to each member of the committee?

Thanks,

David Horowitz

Joyce Brewer

From: Alli K Koepnick <allikhollingsworth@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 19, 2023 11:44 PM
To: Joyce Brewer
Cc: craigrcobia@gmail.com
Subject: Bill S1136

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

Comments for Monday (3/20) 8 am meeting.

I believe that the filter proposed in the S1136 bill would be of great value to the state of Idaho. As a young women preparing to bring children into this world in the near future, I want ways to protect my kids. I see this as one way to accomplish this. Knowing that a filter was within the set up of a phone to protect my child would bring me great comfort. Pornography is a beast. The science is there. Protecting kids from pornography means that the future leaders of Idaho and this country will be better prepared to serve in coming years.

Carl Szabo
Vice President & General Counsel, NetChoice
Washington, DC 20005



Idaho SB 1163

OPPOSITION TESTIMONY

March 19, 2023

Idaho State Senate
Senate State Affairs

NetChoice respectfully asks that you oppose SB 1163 because. As it:

- Violates the 1st Amendment of the US Constitution;
- Usurps and undermines the traditional role of Idaho families; and
- Disincentivizes technological innovations to keep kids safe online.

As further outlined below, this bill would immediately invite constitutional challenges. In fact, the Supreme Court has already struck down a similar bill after finding it violated the First Amendment rights to receive information and to free speech.

Additionally, the bill represents a major government incursion into the traditional role that the family has played in Idaho and American history. Parents are the best stewards of their own children, not the state. SB 1163 could give families the false impression that parental oversight into the online practices of their kids is no longer necessary, thereby making it more likely young Idahoans are exposed to vile content.

Finally, the bill is more likely to freeze the innovation of parental control products rather than spur them. As it stands, there are many different options in the marketplace for parents to choose from, and manufacturers and developers compete with each other to create more attractive products. To avoid any of these negative outcomes, the committee should reject SB 1163.

SB 1163 violates the First Amendment

Congress passed the Communications Decency Act in 1996. The law was an attempt to restrict the access of minors to obscene content on the internet. The legislation criminalized the “knowing” dissemination of “obscene or indecent” material or knowingly sending messages “that, in context, depicts or describes,

Idaho parents need to be empowered to make the decisions they deem appropriate for their own children. Government should not be making the de facto choice on their behalf that a family must then remedy. If the state wants to be a genuine partner to parents in their efforts to keep kids safe online, there are much more targeted, constitutional remedies available.

States, like Florida, have begun to consider online and social media specific education in the classroom. This would help arm young people with the information they need to keep their data more secure, focused on age appropriate content, and away from bad actors who would do them harm.

States, like Florida, have begun to consider online and social media specific education in the classroom. This would help arm young people with the information they need to keep their data more secure, focused on age appropriate content, and away from bad actors who would do them harm. The state could also take steps to publicize the resources that are available to filter content or monitor and control screen time. Solutions for families and kids don't need to come in the form of big government mandates. Parents should be treated like the responsible adults they are, not like criminals in need of filtering and monitoring.

Government intrusion will make filtering tech worse, not better.

As it stands, dozens of manufacturers and other private companies offer device filtering technology and other parental control software to help kids stay safe online. Due to the incentives of the free market, all of those entities compete tirelessly against each other for business. That means technology is always improving, services are getting more sophisticated and easy to use, and over time kids are safer for it.

SB 1163 would take a wrecking ball to the entire private market of these offerings. With broad, confusing language, and legal liability attached, the freedom to innovate would be stripped away. A one-size-fits-all approach to filtering and child safety would need to be adopted in order for companies to be sure that they would avoid lawsuits or government sanction.

The elimination of competition and the creation of a single, government-approved mode of ensuring a child-safe online environment would be the end of innovation in this space. That would be a disaster. Everyone agrees that more can be done to keep kids safe online, but that is only a reasonable possibility

when there is freedom for our innovators to create new solutions. Innovation at the speed of government is not a wise model for this committee to adopt.

* * *

For these reasons, we respectfully ask you to **oppose SB 1163**. As ever, we offer ourselves as a resource to discuss any of these issues with you in further detail, and we appreciate the opportunity to provide the committee with our thoughts on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Carl Szabo
Vice President & General Counsel
NetChoice

NetChoice is a trade association that works to make the internet safe for free enterprise and free expression.

Joyce Brewer

From: Miki Scott <tomandmikiscott@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 10:32 AM
To: Joyce Brewer
Subject: Testimony Support for Idaho Senate Bill 1163 - Parental Rights, Protect Minors Act

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

PARENTAL RIGHTS PROTECTION OF MINORS ACT MINOR SMARTPHONE FILTER BILL S1163

Miki Scott
808 W Pima Ave
Coolidge, AZ 85128
520-251-1835
tomandmikiscott@gmail.com

I am Miki Scott, testifying in support of Idaho Senate Bill 1163. I am an executive officer for Citizens for Decency, a non-profit organization from Idaho that empowers others to take a stand against pornography. My position is Chief of Staff. I live in Arizona; however, I received my education online from BYU-Idaho and graduated last year. My decision to attend a school in Idaho and work for Citizens for Decency supported Madison County's economy.

With the encouragement of Representative Rod Furniss, a conference was held in Rigby, Idaho, in October of last year to educate community members regarding the harmful effects of pornography and to help families take preventative measures for their safety and wellbeing. Under the direction of Dr. Craig Cobia, chairman of Citizens for Decency, two excellent interns and I spent considerable time planning and helping execute the conference. Hundreds of community members attended the event to hear from professionals that work in the fight against pornography. These experts included a renowned neurosurgeon; the founder, and president of Fight the New Drug; the director of Parent and Child Advocacy at the National Center on Sexual Exploitation; an emeritus general authority for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and a professional speaker; and a board member of the State of Idaho's Health & Welfare Department and an advocate in promoting and protecting the family.

I became involved in standing against pornography because I witnessed first-hand the devastating effects of a loved one who stepped into the dark world of pornography that snared and distorted his mind into making choices that negatively affected every aspect of his life and those around him. So much so, that there was a loss of work, relationships, self-esteem, and the ability to make sound, decisions. This person was an adolescent when entrapped through modern-day technology. It took over 15 years for him to heal and make a positive contribution to society.

The youth today are up against so many destructive issues in our society. Putting filters on smartphones to help in the fight against pornography's harmful vices is a step in the right direction of protecting our children and grandchildren.

Joyce Brewer

From: Ronald Smith <tetonser@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2023 8:53 PM
To: Joyce Brewer; craigcobia@gmail.com
Cc: craigcobia@gmail.com
Subject: Senate Bill 1163

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

Newscaster Paul Harvey stated frequently on his radio program, "Self-government won't work without self-discipline". I do not like the idea of more government intrusion into our private lives. Do we not already have plenty of laws that intrude? The computers in our cars can track our every trip, to church, to a football game, to a clandestine meeting to purchase drugs, or whatever. We have cameras at every busy intersection in our cities. It seems that every neighbor has a security camera. A few terrorists have created the need for screeners for every flight that we take, (gratefully). In spite of these numerous laws, do we have enough to protect our children from becoming sexual predators, or victims of sexual predators? Serial killer, Ted Bundy, prior to his execution, in a publicized interview, stated his behavior began with pornography.

I also believe that we cannot ignore the lack of self-discipline! Pornography has existed for centuries. With the creation of the internet, lucrative access to porn sites has grown exponentially! In our privacy we can find any type of content we desire. Daily we read of sexual perversion initiated by pornography. There are those among us who feel untouchable because their voyeuristic desires are done in private. At some point in time those desires become acted upon. Who are the victims? They are those most innocent youth among us. We have all heard of clergy, schoolteachers, administrators, coaches, neighbors, family, police officers, politicians, etc. who have been convicted of sexual crimes. Predators, sexual deviants, are among us. Let's provide the tools for those who are most vulnerable.

It is my opinion that we have shown enough lack of self-discipline in this area to merit the opportunity to protect our children! Please protect our youth!

Joyce Brewer

From: Ron Tietjen <ron@rexburg.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2023 8:08 AM
To: Joyce Brewer; Craig Cobia
Subject: S1163

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

S1163



Ron Tietjen <ron@rexburg.com>

to sstaf, Craig



Thu, Feb 16, 5:05 AM

Gentlemen:

I am the father of 7 boys and 3 girls and the grandfather of 52 grandchildren. Pornography was not a great problem with our children as cell phones had not been readily available when they were growing up. However, several of our grandchildren have had problems with pornography on their cell phones as it is so readily available. It has destroyed some of their dreams and goals for the future. It is very habit forming and has kept them from more meaningful activities and education.

I am very supportive of S1163 known as "Parental Rights Minor Smartphone Filter bill"

Thank You,

Ronald Tietjen
2650 West Hwy 33
Rexburg, Idaho 83440
208-313-3112
ron@rexburg.com

Joyce Brewer

From: pbwells8@q.com
Sent: Sunday, March 19, 2023 8:00 AM
To: Joyce Brewer
Cc: 'Craig Cobia'
Subject: Senate Bill S1163

Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

My wife and I served for 4 years at BYU-Idaho. Our assignment was to help students both male and female overcome their addiction to pornography. During the four years, we worked with about 100 students, over 50 on a regular basis. There were a few females but mainly male students.

In working with the students, I always inquired at what age were they introduced to pornography and how. The age was between 8 and 15 years old. The majority started at age around 11. The source of the pornography was not inappropriate books at school or the library. The source of the pornography without exception was cell phones provided either by their parents at a young age or by looking at their friends cell phones. There on the internet they have access to innumerable sources of the same material that is in all those "inappropriate books" and much more.

As legislators, you can focus on removing inappropriate books from libraries and at schools and make minimal, if any impact, on the youths' lives. Or you can focus on the real source of the material by voting for bill S1163.

Signed

Phillip Wells

208-957-0787